

LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

Editor : R. Palme Dutt



TRYGVE LIE

END THE COLD WAR

AGNES SMEDLEY

HER LAST ARTICLE

JAMES ALDRIDGE

TRIBUTE TO AGNES SMEDLEY

July 1950

Price: One Shilling

GRIN AND CHAGRIN

WHAT alarm and despondency is caused among atomaniacs by that small word peace! And how heartening it is to see one's own signature on a peace petition in good company—knowing well that we already number many millions, and in every country of the world. But for the atomaniacs there is danger in numbers. That even shows in their faces. A reader from the U.S. refers to press photographs of Truman, as he glumly received Trygve Lie reporting 'on his 1950 Mission to Moscow. In profile the President's face is a stony, expressionless mask. The customary grin has been replaced by chagrin'. Peace missions are bad for the war business, no doubt. Comment from a London industrial worker: 'That little white dove of Picasso certainly has the warmongers worried. It will prove stronger than the American eagle yet!' Our recent numbers—each one a special Peace issue—have rung the bell time and again, as readers eagerly write to point out. From New York: 'May was exceptionally fine, even for L.M.' Writes a reader from Stockport: 'L.M. is absolutely indispensable for the lead it gives in the struggle for peace and socialism. R.P.D.'s Notes alone are a gem in socialist literature. Here's a small token of my thanks.' And 'A Socialist Airman' writes this: 'Good luck in your policy of "straight lefts" to the State Department and Whitehall, and keep the punch in them. Yours is the cause of peace and socialism'. Peace and socialism; indeed, it is one cause: scratch a phoney Socialist, find a phoney on peace, too.

'CRIMSON SEAL'

Here's a translation of the poem in the top left-hand corner of last month's picture of Chinese peasants getting their title deeds:

Land reform
Starts new life,
Title deeds for each,
Joy for all;
Black ink, white paper,
Crimson seal!
Now we produce,
Raise prosperous families,
Each day higher.

WE GET A VISIT

Scottish readers on holiday in London paid us a welcome visit recently. It was a pleasure for us. Having left home before their June L.M. had arrived they were not up-to-date with the latest reader-news; but we soon put that right. That's a point. You remember to see that the cat is cared for; you stop the milk and the bread; but why not arrange to have your L.M. sent on to your holiday address? Or order it through the local newsagent—ahead of time. Events move too quickly for any of us to afford to be left behind. Don't wait to see it days late: it is on sale everywhere by the first of the month. If it reaches you late, complain to us.

Continued on inside back cover.

	Page
NOTES OF THE MONTH: 'Cold War' Controversy, by R.P.D.	289
A TRIBUTE TO AGNES SMEDLEY: by James Aldridge	301
TERROR BOMBING IN CHINA: Agnes Smedley's last article	302
DORKING SOCIALISM: by John Gollan	305
END THE 'COLD WAR': by Trygve Lie	310
DAMNING EVIDENCE	315
OPPRESSION IN INDIA: by D. N. Pritt, K.C.	318
LAZLO RUDAS: an obituary	325
FASCIST OVERTURE, II: by James Klugmann	326
TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO	300

Book Reviews:

Mr. Chairman! by Wal Hannington: <i>Arthur Horner</i>	331
The Human Species, by Anthony Barnett: <i>C. P. Dutt</i>	332
Gordon Watson, Life and Writings, by Elsie Locke: <i>Bob Stewart</i>	334
Communism and Liberty, by Rodney Hilton: <i>Arthur Clegg</i>	335
Theory and Practice of Communism, by R. N. C. Hunt: <i>R.P.D.</i>	335
SHORTER NOTICE: <i>P.S.</i>	336

Notes of the Month

"Cold War" Controversy

CAN the 'cold war' be ended? A full-scale public controversy has now developed on this question. The immediate starting point of this controversy has been the diplomatic initiative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Trygve Lie. On April 8 Trygve Lie made his speech at Geneva (reproduced in this number), in which he called for the ending of the 'cold war' this year and gave the warning that its continuance would lead to a third world war. Between April 20 and May 15 he visited the Heads of the Governments of the United States, Britain, France and the U.S.S.R. On June 6 he published his Memorandum sent to all the Governments of the United Nations outlining in ten points a Twenty Year Programme for peace. Thus the question has been publicly posed in such a way as to compel all Governments and political representatives in all countries to declare where they stand.

Inescapable Choice

It is a symptom of the advancing strength of the world peace movement, of the sense of urgency of the war danger, and of the anxiety of the peoples in all countries over the menace of war, that this controversy has now broken through all barriers of silence and boycott, and forced its way to the forefront. For the question which is now being raised as the choice between continuing or ending the 'cold war' is in fact nothing other than the present immediate form of the question of acceptance or rejection of a third world war. The policy of the 'cold war' is the policy of conscious preparation of a third world war. It is the prelude or ante-chamber of a third world war. When this question is raised, it is the central decisive question of the whole present period, governing all others, which is being raised. There have been a hundred controversies over foreign policy, from Greece to Indonesia, and from the Atlantic Pact to atomic energy. Today a stage has been reached when the central strategy governing all these, the policy of the 'cold war', which is still the officially proclaimed policy of the Western Powers, is being directly challenged from increasingly wide quarters.

New Allies for Peace

There is a further significant feature about the way in which this controversy has now come to the forefront. Previously the Soviet Union and the left were to a considerable degree alone in condemning the 'cold war' and defending the thesis of the peaceful co-existence of differing social systems. Now the challenge to the 'cold war' has come from influential quarters unconnected with the left. Trygve Lie has spoken officially as Secretary-General of the United Nations, unconnected with any power grouping, and not as the representative of any particular country or of any particular political alignment (the party with which he has been associated, the Norwegian Labour Party, is in fact an ardent supporter of the 'cold war'). His challenge has been further reinforced by the latest Report of the European Economic Commission of the United Nations (the most important passages in which have been suppressed in the press in this country). This Report opened a direct offensive against the 'cold war' policy by explicitly criticising the 'restrictive export policy of the United States' and the discriminatory system of export licensing controls operated by the United States, Britain and Western European countries in the American orbit, which obstruct the development of East-West trade. Introducing this

Report at Geneva on May 29, the Secretary of the European Economic Commission, Dr. Myrdal, said:

It is only one of the costs of the cold war. Another . . . is the growing burden of military expenditures which threatens to stifle again, as it has so often done in the past, the chances of economic progress.

Thus the voices of protest against the 'cold war' are growing in volume from all sides.

Champions of the 'Cold War'

On the other side, the official champions of the 'cold war' have leaped forward to its defence. Mr. McNeill, on behalf of the British Government, publicly answered Mr. Lie on May 27, and declared that 'there can be no expectation that the cold war will end next year or the year after or the year after that'. Sir Alexander Cadogan, former right-hand man of Chamberlain for Munich, and since continued by the Labour Government as British representative on the Security Council of the United Nations, out-trumped Mr. McNeill by declaring that the 'cold war' might have to be carried on 'for generations'. And Mr. Acheson at the Atlantic Powers Council made clear as the keynote of his policy that the 'cold war' must be intensified to the utmost, and (in the terms of *The Times* summary of his views) 'that the "cold war" must be accepted as a permanent feature of future planning'. Thus the controversy is in the open.

What is the 'Cold War'?

What, then, is this 'cold war'? The formula is an American invention, which first gained currency in 1947, at the time of the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan, to define the orientation of American policy directed towards building up an economic, political and military coalition against the Soviet Union and Communism. The formula, like Goebbels' 'Iron Curtain', was originally intended as a propaganda weapon against the Soviet Union—that is, as a lying picture of the peace policy of the Soviet Union, since the Soviet Union could not be accused of war measures, in order to justify the war policy of the Western Powers. But practice proved stronger than propaganda. The 'cold war' has become the officially accepted definition of the policy of the Western Powers. Indeed, the *Economist* (May 27), aware of the growing unpopularity of this war policy, has been reduced to a comic lamentation over the use of the phrase, which has proved such a boomerang:

If any one thing more than another could advance the cause to which the Western nations are bending their efforts, it would be to stop des-

cribing it as the 'cold war'. The phrase is of American origin. . . Though it served a useful purpose two years ago . . . its present use serves what is almost the opposite purpose of enabling the Russians to pose as the champions of peace. *On the one side, the Americans and their cold war. On the other side, the Russians and Picasso's dove of peace.*

And the solution? To change the policy? Not at all. The solution offered is to change the phrase. Just as the 'Empire' became the 'Commonwealth', and the 'Derelict Areas' (later, 'Distressed Areas') became 'Special Areas', the *Economist* suggests that the 'Cold War' of the Western Powers should be re-baptised 'Peace through Strength' (a pleasant echo of their great exemplar's 'Strength through Joy'). And sure enough, Truman and Acheson in their latest utterances have jumped to adopt the suggestion.

Earlier Origins

In point of fact the American 'cold war' policy goes considerably further back than 1947, when it first received public codified expression in the notorious article of 'X', representing G. F. Kennan, Policy Planning Director of the State Department, in *Foreign Affairs* for July of that year. Its earlier origin has been described by Ralph Parker in his 'Conspiracy Against Peace'. Parker, who was *The Times* correspondent in Moscow when the Jesuit-trained Kennan was Minister of the U.S. Embassy, relates how on Victory Day in 1945, while the Moscow crowds were rejoicing in the prospect of peace, Kennan from the American Embassy window looked down on the crowds with 'a curiously petulant, irritated look' and 'said grimly':

They are cheering. They think the war is over, but it's only just beginning.

Parker, who as *The Times* correspondent had unrivalled opportunities for knowing the full facts of Anglo-American diplomacy in Moscow, continues:

The declaration of 'cold war' on the Soviet Union was made when the Soviet Army was still locked in fearful struggle with Hitler's forces. The Oder line was yet to be broken, Budapest was still in German hands, the Ruhr not yet overrun by Eisenhower's troops. But a Soviet victory was certain and the State Department's representative Kennan was already engaged on laying plans for a new war. Its victims were to be the masses of people in all the world. With icy-hearted ruthlessness this strategist of the 'cold war' and propagandist of the U.S.A.'s anti-Soviet policy calculated that victory would find the Soviet people 'physically and spiritually tired'.

It was before this man of violent hatred not only of the Soviet Union

but of all democratic mankind, before this strategist of the criminal 'cold war' that the British Ambassador in Moscow, Sir Archibald Clark Kerr, bowed so humbly.

The origins of the Anglo-American 'cold war' against the Soviet Union thus go back before the ending of the war, as indeed Churchill's Memorandum of 1942 has since revealed. This disposes of the myth, sedulously spread by Labour propagandists, of the imaginary 'fund of good will' which Anglo-American diplomats are supposed to have had towards the Soviet Union at the end of the war (in fact the San Francisco Conference had already revealed the open anti-Soviet manoeuvres) and which is supposed to have been 'exhausted' by Soviet post-war diplomacy.

American War Plan of 1945

Similar evidence is afforded by Walter Lippmann, the most authoritative publicist on American diplomatic policy. In the *New York Herald-Tribune* of September 12, 1946, he wrote:

Early last winter the United States Government made the momentous decision to take the leading part in repelling the expansion of the Soviet Empire. As a result, we are now engaged in a world-wide diplomatic struggle of the utmost gravity. . . The direct American policy would be to build up American power at a selected point where, *if war comes, the Soviet Union would from the outset be on the defensive*. That point is manifestly in the Eastern Mediterranean, in the direction of the Black Sea. For at that point *American sea and air power can be brought within reach of the vital centres of Russia*.

Walter Lippmann's close knowledge of American policy is unchallenged and indisputable; and his evidence is all the more important, because he shares the anti-Soviet viewpoint. According to Lippmann, the American anti-Soviet war plan and strategy had already been completely decided by the winter of 1945. All the measures that followed—the Truman Doctrine, military aid to Turkey, Iran and Greece, and in the Far East, the ring of overseas offensive bases, the partition of Germany, the Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact—have only been the successive steps of fulfilment of the 1945 war plan. It is these preparatory war measures which have constituted the 'cold war' policy.

Proclamation of the 'Cold War'

The first public proclamation of the 'cold war' programme, that is, the programme of deliberately building up a military coalition of States against the Soviet Union and Communism, popular democracy or colonial liberation, with the open prospect of a third

world war, was made in Winston Churchill's Fulton speech, with President Truman presiding, in March, 1946. The first governmental declaration of the 'cold war' programme was made with the promulgation of the Truman Doctrine in March, 1947, proclaiming the right of the United States to intervene in all countries and continents in order to establish, maintain, subsidise and arm anti-Soviet Governments in all countries bordering the Soviet Union. The first direct intervention to make and unmake Governments in Western Europe took place in May, 1947, with the pressure on the French Government to exclude the political party which had obtained the widest support of the electorate, followed by the Marshall Plan in June to establish economic control on a basis of subsidies.

Definition of the 'Cold War'

The first formal diplomatic definition of the 'cold war' programme was made in the article published by Kennan on behalf of the State Department ('X') in the United States journal *Foreign Affairs* for July, 1947, which set out the strategy 'to confront the Russians with unalterable counter-force at every point' and openly looked forward to the ultimate objective of the overthrow of the Soviet Union:

It would be an exaggeration to say that American behaviour unassisted and alone could exercise a power of life and death over the Communist movement and bring about the early fall of Soviet power in Russia. But the United States has it in its power to increase enormously the strains under which Soviet policy must operate. . .

Soviet power . . . bears within itself the seeds of its own decay. The sprouting of these seeds is well advanced; if anything were to occur to disrupt the unity and efficacy of the Party as a political instrument Soviet Russia might be changed overnight from one of the strongest to one of the weakest and most pitiable of national societies.

This language closely parallels its prototype, Hitler's 'Mein Kampf', which also sought to present the aims of aggressive anti-Soviet war under the guise of oracular prophecies of the impending downfall of the Soviet Union ('the colossal Empire in the East is ripe for dissolution'). All these openly aggressive measures and proclamations of the Western Powers' 'cold war' took place, it should be noted, *before* the defensive measures of the formation of the Information Bureau of European Communist Parties in the autumn of 1947 and the defeat of the attempted counter-revolutionary coup and victory of the working class in Czechoslovakia in 1948, which certain propagandists, counting on the shortness of

public memory, have endeavoured to present as 'origins' of the 'cold war'.

Essence of the 'Cold War'

The essence of the 'cold war' programme is thus a programme of aggressive expansion, intervention and preparation of a new world war; extension of American economic, political and military power in the non-communist world; open hostility to the countries of communism and people's democracy; rupture of international co-operation and building of a sectional military coalition outside the United Nations, with openly offensive strategic preparations, directed to the ultimate aim to establish 'a power of life and death over the Communist movement' and 'the early fall of Soviet power in Russia'. It is obvious that this programme is a tolerably close reproduction of Hitler's programme on an enlarged scale.

Dropping the Mask

For public consumption, this aggressive programme is disguised under a thin camouflage of 'defence'. But the camouflage has long worn through. The 'cold war' of the Western Powers was initially explained as the answer to the imaginary 'cold war' of the Soviet Union—the trick formula used to describe the advance of the Communist movement or national liberation anywhere in the world. But this pretence is soon forgotten, and, as the *Economist* has complained, 'instead of resisting Russia's "cold war" the Western Powers now talk of waging one of their own'. The military measures and obvious preparations for a third world war were originally explained as only precautionary measures against the 'menace' of Soviet 'aggression'. But this pretence has also broken down, as it becomes obvious that only the Western Powers are waging war (Britain in Malaya, France in Viet-Nam, the United States in the Philippines, Holland in Indonesia), while the Soviet Union alone has consistently maintained peace since 1945 and withdrawn all its troops within its frontiers except in ex-enemy countries.

Humpty Dumpty Language

It is now admitted even by the protagonists of the 'cold war' that the Soviet Union has no intention of launching war. Hence the formula of 'aggression' is revised to 'indirect aggression' which is used to cover every struggle of the working people or colonial peoples against their exploiters. In this way a topsy turvy carica-

ture of words is created, by which, if the Chinese people fight and win their freedom, without the participation of a single Soviet soldier or Soviet arms, this is dubbed 'Russian aggression', while if the United States pours in troops, bombing 'planes and six billion dollars of arms and subsidies to maintain an admittedly corrupt fascist despotism against the people, this is termed 'defence of democracy against aggression'. Similarly, Morgan Phillips can speak without a blush to an international 'socialist' conference at Copenhagen of the unity of the 'free world' of Africa under colonial domination against the 'un-free world' where the capitalists and landlords have been driven out and the working people rule. All these tricks of language can no longer conceal the realities of aggression and armed intervention. In the words of the Vice-President of the United States, Alben Barkley, on May 22:

We must maintain armed forces all over the world. . . The United States may have to occupy more countries before the cold war is ended.

From 'Cold War' to World War

Is the Atlantic Pact only a measure of 'defence' against a hypothetical military attack or invasion by the Soviet Union? This deception, with which it has been sought to allay the rising alarms of the peoples in the Atlantic Pact countries, has now also been exploded. The most revealing indication of the real intentions of the promoters of the Atlantic Pact for the preparation of a third world war was recently afforded by the answer of the U.S. Minister of Defence, Louis Johnson, to the enquiries of the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee on June 5 in connection with the supply of £436 million worth of arms to the American satellite countries. Questioned as to the conditions under which the Atlantic Pact would come into operation, and who would determine whether 'aggression' had taken place, he refused to reply on the grounds that any public answer on this crucial point would play into Communist hands:

Senator Connally asked who would determine whether there had been an armed attack on an Atlantic Treaty country which would require other signatories to come to its defence. Mr. Johnson said that any answer would be misrepresented and exploited by the Communist press. (*Manchester Guardian*, June 6.)

The refusal of an answer is more revealing than an answer. It is obvious that if the Atlantic Pact were only intended to come into operation in the event of an armed invasion of an Atlantic Pact country by the Soviet Union or other Power, he would have had no difficulty in reaffirming this publicly and denying any contrary

suggestion. The refusal to make this answer, and insistence that the conditions of operation of the Atlantic Pact must remain secret, is sufficient indication that the Atlantic Pact is intended to come into operation under very different circumstances.

Bankruptcy of the 'Cold War' Strategy

It is against this 'cold war' policy, with all the suffering that it entails, and the increasingly open preparation of a third world war, that the revolt of the peoples is rising in all the countries affected by it. For three years since its public promulgation this 'cold war' programme has openly governed the entire policy of the Western Powers and dominated the internal economic and political situation in every country under their control. The results have been disastrous. Even the protagonists of the 'cold war' have been compelled to admit the bankruptcy of their total war strategy. At the outset three years ago, immediately following its public proclamation as a governing policy, Walter Lippmann, while agreeing with the political aims, criticised the strategy in his pamphlet 'The Cold War; a Study in U.S. Foreign Policy':

The policy can be implemented only by recruiting, subsidising and supporting a heterogeneous array of satellites, clients, dependents and puppets. The instrument of the policy of containment is therefore a coalition of disorganised, disunited, feeble or disorderly nations, tribes and factions around the perimeter of the Soviet Union. . .

It would require, however much the real name for it were disavowed, continual and complicated intervention by the United States in the affairs of all the members of the coalition which we were proposing to organise, to protect, to lead and to use.

This warning has been confirmed by events. But the biggest factor countering the policy was not foreseen by Lippmann. The 'cold war' policy has come up against the rising liberation movement of the peoples in all the areas affected, and the rising demand of the peoples for peace.

Revolt Against the 'Cold War'

It is not only the dream of atom bomb monopoly, which was the key to the Churchillian conception of the 'cold war' and third world war, that was exploded already by 1947. It is not only the colossal military intervention in China, which was the main field of United States military concentration, that has ended in complete fiasco. All the peoples of South East Asia are moving no less inexorably forward to freedom; and the ceaselessly intensified measures of military terror now being brought into operation against them, even

with the blessing of the latter-day Noske, Strachey, stand no more prospect of being crowned with success than his previous efforts to extract groundnuts from the enslavement of Africa. The Middle East, which is designed by the protagonists of a third world war to be the main battleground and offensive base of their planned war, is seething with unrest beneath the façade of the corrupt subsidised terror régimes maintained by British and American cash for the 'defence of democracy'. The recent call of the Syrian Minister, Dawalibi, for peace against the war plans, expressed to the correspondent of the Egyptian *Al-Misri* on April 9, aroused an echo throughout the Arab Middle East:

I am convinced that the object of the frequent visits of American military commanders to the Middle East is to turn our countries into a military base, in spite of the fact that this is against our interest. The Middle East will be saved from a future war only if the Arab world concludes a treaty of non-aggression with the Soviet Union. This is the only way to guarantee peace for the Arabs.

On this the *Alef Ba* commented:

Let the whole world know that Minister Dawalibi expressed the sentiments of all the Arab peoples. The Arab Governments should extend a hand to the Soviet Union.

In Central Europe the Berlin Youth Rally and the German-Polish Peace Pact are building ramparts of peace in the very region where the aggression of a third world war is being planned. In Western Europe, the very base of the Atlantic war coalition, the instability of the ground for the war plans is being revealed, not only by the mass response to the Stockholm peace petition, but by the increasing indications of 'neutrality' talk in reactionary ruling quarters, which has alarmed the Anglo-American war camp.

Which Way Western Europe?

American arms are pouring into Western Europe to prepare a conflagration. But already the incendiaries are expressing their fears of what will be the final destiny of those arms. Revulsion against the war plans spreads throughout Continental Europe. The *Economist* of May 27 complains that the contrast between the American 'cold war' propaganda and the Soviet campaign for peace

is encouraging European faint hearts and defeatists to accuse the Americans of pursuing a warlike policy in Europe and of dragging along an unwilling Continent at their chariot wheels. When serious writers in *Le Monde* suggest that France must have the right to remain neutral in the event of a Russo-American conflict . . . it is clear that something

has gone very much awry in European thinking. And that something is precisely the concept of a 'cold war' in which America is pictured as creating a western alliance designed to carry war into the Soviet camp.

The Times writes an elaborately argued editorial on 'The Fallacy of Neutrality'. The Labour Party Executive comes out with its statement on 'European Unity' to combat the once beloved 'Third Front' idea of a Western Europe counterposed to American capitalism and Soviet communism, and to insist on subordination to the American empire and its war plans. The *Manchester Guardian* Washington correspondent describes on June 9 the 'reciprocal misgivings about good faith' between the American war-lords and their European satellites:

Many Americans undoubtedly fear that, if war comes soon, several Continental countries, France especially, will at best retire from the brawl and declare themselves 'open countries', or at worst allow their American supplies to be seized by the enemy. This American fear is aggravated by the warm reception among French moderates for the Stockholm Peace Plan.

The rift is developing in the war camp. The cause of peace marches forward.

Opening for Peace

These developments reveal that the growth of the popular movement for peace is bringing new factors into the international political situation. They do not yet mean the diminution of the war danger. On the contrary, the panic and desperation of the war camp increases the immediate urgency of the danger of war. But new doors are opening for the advance of the fight for peace. The initiative of Trygve Lie has opened such a door. It has brought into the forefront of public discussion the question of concrete steps to end the 'cold war'. The practical steps necessary for this end are evident. First, the restoration of effective functioning of the United Nations by recognition of the rightful place of the Chinese Government on the Security Council. Second, a collective Peace Pact of the Five Great Powers, and resumption of Great Power co-operation to settle differences by negotiation on the lines of Yalta and Potsdam. Third, prohibition of atomic weapons and all weapons of mass destruction, and all-round reduction of armaments. Fourth, Peace Treaties with a united democratic disarmed Germany, and with a democratic disarmed Japan, and withdrawal of all occupation troops. Fifth, extension of East-West trade.

Who Will Decide?

The 'cold war' is planned in the chancelleries and staff headquarters of Washington and London. But the last word rests with the peoples. If the peoples can be mobilised and united for peace, the war plans will not go through. This is the significance of the World Peace Petition initiated at Stockholm. The courageous initiative of Trygve Lie in calling for the ending of the 'cold war' has placed a new weapon in the hands of all who fight for peace. But it is the millions of men and women in all countries who alone can wield this weapon to make it effective and win the fight for peace.

June 15, 1950.

R.P.D.

FROM THE *LABOUR MONTHLY* OF 25 YEARS AGO

WORKING CLASS UNITY

ONCE again ringing through the industrial areas of Britain—in every mine, workshop and factory—is that blessed word Unity. Economic conditions in Britain compel the workers and their leaders to seek help and guidance to face the problems of 1925. We have to face a great capitalist offensive—wages, hours and conditions are being attacked in every industry. The forward march of Trade Unionism that met such a severe check in 1921 is again in danger of receiving another check in 1925. There is unanimous agreement among the workers that 1921 must never be repeated.

By A. J. Cook, General Secretary, Miners' Federation of Great Britain, in 'The Problem of the Hour—Is Unity Possible?' in *Labour Monthly*, July, 1925.

A TRIBUTE TO AGNES SMEDLEY

JAMES ALDRIDGE

AGNES SMEDLEY, who died last May in England, will be forever remembered by all who have a belief in the future. It was she who first brought to the West the true story of the Great Chinese revolt. She spent over 10 years in China, recording with fire and with tenderness the tremendous tasks of the revolutionary armies and their leaders. When their victory was certain, she returned to America to win sympathy and understanding for the New China.

This brought about her destruction, for she was hounded out of America by General MacArthur and his friends. They accused her, on the basis of pre-war Japanese police files, of being a Soviet agent in China. Far from being docile to such insults, she reviled her accusers with heroic contempt, even threatening to sue the War Department for libel. The charges were withdrawn, ignobly. Though she won this first round of the battle, she knew that sooner or later another trumped-up charge would be found; and she was so officially hated and feared that a gaol sentence seemed ultimately certain.

She was 57 years of age, and although the fight against the slanderers had taken time and ruined her health, she had already started to write the life and work of Chu Teh, the Chinese leader. In a desperate attempt to regain some moment of peace and health to finish this work, she came to England. Even here, she felt the petty threat of the official bullies. Her American passport was only valid for one year and for the British Empire. She was therefore forbidden to go to China, and she saw little likelihood of her passport being renewed even to stay in England.

To write her last work on China, she was racing against time—legal and lethal. As it turned out, death beat the State Department, although her end was encouraged by the continuous official threat to her peaceable existence. She died of duodenal ulcers, in an Oxford nursing home.

Agnes Smedley should never have died in England—she should never have been in England at all. Her choice for living and dying would have been China (to which she gave her life) or America (which took it). Even so, she died a heroine and a visionary, and if her vision was mainly of a new existence for the wretched millions of China, she embraced equally the dispossessed of every land, par-

ticularly those of America, for she herself was of humblest working-class origin.

So, too, she loved America no less for loving China so much. She was American to the heart's core: and, may it be said by an Englishman—a very great American.

TERROR BOMBING IN CHINA

Agnes Smedley's last article

[Written by Agnes Smedley on March 11 (shortly before she died in the nursing home at Oxford), this article, which discloses terrible facts and sounds a serious warning, is all the more significant in view of the shameless smear campaign which has continued even after her death. The growing nearness of the war danger alone makes this last article a powerful aid to the fight for peace.—Ed., L.M.]

As everyone knows, the main coastal and some of the inland cities of central and south China, and also Tsingtao in the north, are being subjected to wanton air-raids in which thousands of people are being killed. Following the first raid on Shanghai some two weeks ago, the nationals of some 19 nations living in that city sent a protest to the United Nations stating that around a thousand people had been killed and the city deprived of light and water. The United Nations has done nothing in reply to this protest.

For weeks now, the Chinese press in China proper, and in Hong-kong, has been publishing serious reports about Japanese troops, officers and pilots who were being secretly sent to Formosa from Japan—with General MacArthur's permission and undoubted assistance. The *Ta Kung Pao*, the greatest Chinese newspaper combine that publishes dailies in a number of Chinese cities, recently reported that there are some 100,000 Japanese troops alone on Formosa, and that at least some of the pilots in the 'planes bombing Chinese cities today are Japanese, while others are Americans. The entire Chinese press reported the arrival in Tokyo of Chiang Kai-shek's chief representative, General Wu Teh-chen, to negotiate with General MacArthur for the use of Japanese troops and pilots against the new China—following which the Japanese concentration on Formosa began. They were, of course, called 'volunteers' just as any American there is called a 'volunteer'. American military officers have been shuffling back and forth between Tokyo and Formosa by air for some time.

Even the London *Times* (the first week in March) has carried a story from Tokyo in which *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* was quoted as admitting that a number of Japanese Army officers had gone to Formosa. The names of a number of Generals were mentioned.

The concentration of at least a part of the American fleet, including an aircraft carrier, in the coastal waters of China, is also of vast significance, particularly in the recent bombing of Tsingtao which, in so far as I am informed, cannot be bombed from Formosa.

The *New China News Agency* of Peking has repeatedly published reports charging that Japanese and American pilots are in charge of the 'planes bombing Chinese cities today. It reported, among many other similar tragedies, that American-made bombers dropped incendiary bombs on the coastal city of Foochow on March 3, burning down 1,700 houses and rendering 6,000 people homeless. It further stated that 'Kuomintang remnants, aided by the U.S.A., are building a new airdrome on Taishan Island in the Chushan Group, near Shanghai', and that 'a scheme is on foot to use a base in South Korea for bombing the major cities of Manchuria and North China'.

Spokesmen of the Chinese People's Republic have repeatedly declared that Japanese and American pilots are in charge of the 'planes bombing Chinese cities today because Chiang Kai-shek cannot trust his own pilots to do the bombings. Large numbers of such Kuomintang airmen took their 'planes and went over to the People's Republic in the past, and Chiang cannot trust the others. The best testimony we have about the reluctance even of Kuomintang airmen to bomb their own people is given in the U.S. State Department's White Paper, entitled *United States Relations with China*, which was published in Washington last summer. On page 333 of this book there is a report by General Barr, an American officer, dated June 2, 1948, which states in part: 'Although it has among its personnel over five thousand United States trained pilots, it (the Kuomintang Air Force) accomplished little. . . . There was an ever-present reluctance to take a chance on losing equipment and personnel, which was clearly reflected in their constant refusal to operate at other than high altitudes. *There was an ingrained resentment in the Chinese Air Force against killing Chinese Communists who had no air support*'. (Italics mine, A.S.) This reluctance of Kuomintang airmen to kill their own people explains why Chiang Kai-shek cannot trust his own men to do in 1950 what they did not want to do in 1948, particularly since his rôle as an American puppet has become more and more clear.

The conduct of the Kuomintang airmen as described by General Barr differs drastically from the precision bombings of Chinese cities today, which are exact replicas of Japanese bombings of Chungking and other Chinese cities during the war. Nor have we any reason to doubt the soundness of reports of the Chinese press and of the People's Government at Peking. The famous newspaper, *Ta Kung Pao*, for one, for decades has had an excellent staff of experts on Japan and has kept correspondents in every major city in the Far East, while the Chinese People's Government has an excellent intelligence service even in the heart of Chiang Kai-shek's puppet régime on Formosa.

In view of these wanton raids on Chinese cities, we must consider Chiang Kai-shek's loudly-proclaimed plans to invade the China mainland within a short period of time, the plans for which were submitted to the American Government last summer and the outline of which was published in at least one American magazine, the *New Republic*. Let us consider Chiang Kai-shek's invasion force, which totals no more than 250,000 Kuomintang troops and an additional 100,000 Japanese. Since he lost all the rest of his four million army to the People's Liberation Army in the past, he would not dare to invade the China mainland today unless he had the most serious assurance from American warlords that they would come to his aid. Furthermore, Chiang has been joyously proclaiming the coming of the third World War for months, and even before the war with Japan ended, he boasted before a Kuomintang Congress in Chungking that 'I forced the United States to fight Japan and I'll force it to fight the Soviet Union'. He may be insane, but he is nevertheless a treacherous little rattlesnake, just as General Joseph W. Stilwell called him during the war, and there is no doubt but that he, and various American rattlesnakes with him today, hope that by an invasion of China, they can draw the Soviet Union into the *mêlée* and precipitate their long-hoped-for third World War.

A dreadful war plot is being hatched in the Far East, and it includes not only Formosa and Japan, but Indo-China. Yet the secret forces behind this plot are not yet known to the people of the world, certainly not to the peoples of Japan, America, Britain, and the peoples of some of the countries of Europe. To expose and protest, and finally to appeal to the people of America in particular, is the rôle of every peaceable man of the Western world. But it must be done soon, otherwise the plot will reach its fulfilment in a new world war, beginning in the Far East.

DORKING SOCIALISM

JOHN GOLLAN

THE disastrous consequences of the last General Election with its Tory advance, consequent parliamentary deadlock and virtual coalition, showed up the deep-rooted crisis in the Labour movement. Overhanging the next General Election is the danger of a Tory victory. To the ordinary Labour worker this is the supreme and only issue. Actually the real problem is even more acute.

Since the election the danger of war has grown alarmingly. Profits have risen at the expense of wages. Social services are threatened by the mounting war expenditure. Toryism has become more bellicose while disruption and confusion is rampant in Labour ranks. The municipal elections if anything showed the continuation of the political deadlock. The deadlock, which must be broken if a Tory victory is to be avoided, is not due to the narrowness of Labour's majority. It is due to the nature of the Government's policy. The crisis is a crisis in policy.

A right-wing Labour Government carrying through a Tory programme, because that is what is happening, can only mean eventual war and economic slump. The fight to defeat Toryism, to preserve peace and social advance, requires the defeat of the right wing in the Labour movement and the triumph of a new fighting working class programme which can unite the broad masses of the population around the working class. But this crucial point has not yet become the central issue in the discussions about the future position of the Labour movement. It was not and could not be the central issue at the Dorking discussions of the Labour leaders, the purpose of which was to work out the line for Labour's programme in the next election.

Official silence has shrouded these proceedings. But enough leaked out and sufficient has happened since to show foreign policy as such was not an issue at Dorking. There can be no doubt, however, that it dominated the entire proceedings. The sinister session of the Ministers of the Atlantic Powers took place on the eve of Dorking. The Labour Ministers, Trade Union and Co-operative leaders met with the knowledge that they had connived at far-reaching advanced military decisions with the United States for the third world war.

Hot on the heels of the Dorking Conference have come two important developments. The Labour Party National Executive issued

its official foreign policy statement on 'European Unity'. This document is the tinsel to cover the cynical war alliance of British Social-democracy, American big business and European reaction against the working class and socialism. Social-democracy has long peddled the conception that its policy sought to create a third force between the Soviet Union and America. This idea, long since exploded by the Atlantic Pact, is now officially abandoned and condemned. 'The Third Force', states the document, 'must be a world-wide political alliance against totalitarianism wherever it is found'. In other words, what has in fact existed, the war alliance of the Labour Government and Wall Street against Socialism, is now openly proclaimed as Labour policy. Second development has been the official declaration of war by the Labour leadership on the peace movement. Morgan Phillips hurried from Dorking to the Copenhagen Socialist Conference with his instructions to attack the growing world-wide movement for the banning of the atom bomb.

In Britain as elsewhere this movement is reaching mass proportions. It has been the main reason for the renewed efforts of United Nations Secretary, Trygve Lie, to bring an end to the cold war, efforts opposed by the British Government. Labour's leadership is attempting the impossible when it tries to stop the Labour movement fighting for peace.

Economic policy was a central issue at Dorking. The discussions took place on a background of a rising wages movement embracing millions of workers, in all the main industries, and the growing anxiety of the Trades Union Congress leaders whose wage-freeze policy has been officially repudiated by the majority of trade unionists. Reports claim that the Conference considered a policy of some 'concessions' to lower paid workers in order to have wage-freezing for the majority of workers. It is significant, however, that immediately following the Conference, the General Council of the T.U.C. declared continuing support of the wage-freeze but deplored 'excessive rigidity' in its application. Both Government and Trade Union leaders are in a dilemma. Any wage 'concessions' may well loosen the avalanche which will engulf their policy. Yet the unrest is such that the whole policy is in danger anyway. But if Dorking had nothing to offer the working class except advice to put up with falling real wages while profits soar (they are five per cent. up in 1950 compared with 1949), it has decided to free big business from its last internal restrictions.

As the 1950 Economic Survey showed, the main characteristic of the economic situation in Britain is the ending of the period of war-

time scarcities and the beginnings of the crisis of over-production. Dorking arrived at decisions for the rapid dismantling of as many controls as possible and the outstanding examples have been the end of petrol rationing and, before that, points. These controls were no creation of the Labour Government and *The Economist* has remarked (June 3) that their progressive elimination only goes to show 'how superficial are the differences in economic policy between the two major parties'. Full employment, planning and 'fair shares' have long been held out as three of the essentials of so-called democratic socialism. In the article 'Outlook after Dorking', the *New Statesman* (June 3) remarked that 'Planning, indeed, is disappearing along with scarcity'. The so-called fair shares was always a false slogan to cover a rationing system in which the rich could get what they liked. With rationing largely gone, fair shares has gone and the article asks (but does not answer) 'What is to replace the war-time system of fair shares?'

The new developing economic situation means also the end of full employment, unless Government policy is changed; but on this Dorking had nothing to say. As was widely expected the Conference decided to finish with nationalisation as Labour policy. This decision, heralded by countless official speeches, marks the complete break with the 1918 Labour programme. Nationalisation as carried out by the Labour Government, was a denial of everything for which the Labour pioneers fought. It created state capitalist trusts controlled and run by the old monopolists. But its official abandonment even in words, is a measure of the complete identity of the Labour leadership with monopoly capitalism. Dorking therefore marks a new stage in the efforts of the right wing leaders to destroy the identity of the Labour movement in complete class collaboration with monopoly capitalism.

It is not only a programme of betrayal. Unless changed it can bring a disaster to the Labour movement as great as that of 1931.

Attempts are being made to justify this betrayal by arguing that the issue for the next election is that of winning the middle class, the floating voter, the liberal voter and so on. In a speech at Clapham immediately after the election, Morrison declared, 'Our problem at the next election is to poll a still higher Labour vote and above all to make converts from the people who voted Conservative or Liberal this time'. (*Daily Herald*, 28.2.50.) This is a gross caricature of the central issue for working class advance in the next election, the reduction of the mass vote, which the Tory Party, the party of a small moneyed minority, managed to obtain.

If a real socialist policy had been operated in Britain since 1945, its basis would have been peace, trade and friendship with the U.S.S.R. and the strengthening of the United Nations as a genuine instrument for peace. At home it would have aimed at destroying the economic power of the big monopolies and decisive advance in the living standards of the working class and the widest sections of the population. Such a policy would have unified the people, Labour, Communist and middle class. The big monopolists and their Tory party would have been isolated. United politically, the working class forces would have rallied the whole of the working class and the decisive middle class sections for decisive victory.

Right-wing Social-democracy did the opposite. It pursued an imperialist war policy, the policy of the American war alliance; anti-communist hate, the purge and working class disruption. There was no basic change in class relations. Despite concessions won by working class strength, its policy of class collaboration, repudiation of socialism and outright defence of monopoly capitalism, strengthened the class power of the employers and the rich, the main social base of Toryism. Toryism reaped the fruits of the political and economic situation created by the right wing policy. Labour lost even the 1945 allies of the working class.

Between the wars the MacDonald-Snowden reformist leadership brought the Labour movement a succession of disasters. Its result was the failure of the 1924 Labour Government, the betrayal of the General Strike and the collapse of the 1929 Labour Government. The 1931 MacDonald crisis and consequent severe setback was never really resolved in the British Labour movement. MacDonald went but the basic MacDonald reformist ideology remained as the stock-in-trade of the Attlee, Morrison, Bevin leadership. This is the root cause of the policy of the Labour Government since 1945, and, therefore, the electoral crisis of 1950.

Dorking has only deepened that crisis. When Morrison and the right wing leadership talk of the approach to the 'middle class' as the decisive issue, it is on the basis of the fatal policy which has brought about the Tory advance. The virtual coalition policy of the Government since the election shows this. It is the exact opposite of a socialist policy aimed at the monopolists, consolidating and extending working class support, and on this basis, winning the professional and middle class sections around the working class. As Dorking shows, the idea is to make Labour's progress more 'acceptable' by complete abandonment of nationalisation, a still more open defence of imperialism, capitalism and anti-communism, in

competition with Toryism to 'attract' the votes. Such a competition with Toryism, carried out to the accompaniment of still more bitter war on the left and working class disruption, can only open the way to Tory victory. It lays the working class open to the developing employers' offensive, it intensifies the political atmosphere in which Toryism thrives and the Labour movement is disarmed and demoralised.

Dorking high-lights the crisis in the Labour movement, a crisis in many ways more serious than 1931. Then it took a form easy to see, now it is more complex. But even more serious, it is a crisis developing in the midst of the grave danger of war, with the right-wing leaders seeking to dragoon the British people alongside American imperialism in war on socialism. The only way to face that crisis is unity of all left forces, Labour, trade union, co-operative and communist, to challenge and defeat the right-wing domination and policy. What is needed is a counter policy of peace, East-West trade, increased wages, benefits and salaries, and measures of nationalisation which can decisively undermine the power of monopoly capitalism.

The central issue around which all others revolve is the fight for peace, the struggle to ban the atom bomb and end the cold war. Around this a great mass movement is arising which can be decisive in transforming the world situation. All the conditions for victory exist. The Tories can be routed. But to do this requires the unity and struggle of all the forces of the left against the right wing for a new fighting programme. Working class unity around a real people's programme can alone win over the wider sections of the people, isolate Toryism and open the way for new advance in the next election.

WANTED: BACK NUMBERS

THESE back numbers of *Labour Monthly* are urgently needed: 1921, July and September; 1922, January, June and August; 1923, May and September; 1924, February, March, April, May and July; 1925, January and August; 1926, March; 1927, February, May and October; 1928, May, June and August; 1929, May; 1930, January, July, October and December; 1931, September; 1932, March; 1933, March; 1934, June and October; 1935, July. Write to: The Manager, *Labour Monthly*, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

END THE 'COLD WAR'!

TRYGVE LIE

(Text of the address of Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the United Nations, to the Third World Health Assembly in Geneva on May 8, 1950.)

Mr. President, Mr. Director General and Delegates to the Third World Health Assembly.

I am glad that my trip to Europe on several matters of importance to the United Nations has made it possible for me to be here with you today at the opening of the Third World Health Assembly.

The activities of the World Health Organisation have an important place in the work of the United Nations and Specialised Agencies for peace and a higher standard of living. In less than two years of full operation as a permanent Specialised Agency of the United Nations the World Health Organisation has made a fine record. One turns with relief from the destructive conflicts of power and ideology that dominate so much of our attention today to the constructive and humanitarian achievements of your Organisation in saving lives and bringing better health to many millions of human beings.

At the same time I know that you share the concern felt by decent people everywhere about the present situation of the world and about the prospects for peace. The future of your Organisation and the scope of its usefulness are necessarily affected by the course of political events in international affairs. . .

This inter-dependence extends much further. It relates political issues with economic development and trade and food and health—with human rights and the progress of dependent peoples. What happens in the Security Council and General Assembly of the United Nations will have consequences, direct or indirect, for the programme and projects of the World Health Organisation. Similarly, the conclusions and recommendations of the delegates to this World Health Assembly will have a bearing upon the political, economic and social work of the United Nations as a whole. . .

The limitations upon the programmes you wish to adopt for 1951 and the related budgetary restrictions with which you are faced arise primarily from the political, economic and psychological consequences of the 'cold war'. They certainly do not arise from any lack of human needs for a much greater and more universal effort than we can hope for at present, to bring help to the sick and suffer-

ing of this world and to build a foundation in healthier children for a sounder, better and less belligerent tomorrow. . .

I was very much encouraged by the discussions I had in Paris with the Directors General and other representatives of 11 Specialised Agencies. We adopted unanimously a report which will go to the Economic and Social Council in which we declared:

The present division of the world and the increasingly serious conflicts of policy among the Great Powers have gravely impaired the prospects for world peace and for raising the standard of living of the peoples of the world.

The United Nations and Specialised Agencies are founded upon the principle that lasting world peace can only be achieved and maintained by world organisation, and that world problems like disease, hunger, ignorance and poverty, which recognise no frontier, can never be overcome unless all the nations join universal efforts to these ends.

We reaffirm the validity of this principle of universality. The United Nations system makes ample room for diversity within a universal framework. We believe it would be a disaster if efforts to realise the principle of universality in practice were to be abandoned now.

We believe that the greatest efforts should, on the contrary, be directed towards achieving in fact true universality in the membership and programmes of the United Nations and of those of the Specialised Agencies which are founded on that principle.

We also believe that it is necessary for all governments to renew their efforts to conciliate and negotiate the political differences that divide them and obstruct economic and social advancement.

Specifically, we believe that it is essential to the future of both the United Nations and the Specialised Agencies that the present political deadlock in the United Nations be resolved at the earliest possible moment.

The peace and well-being of all peoples demand from their Governments a great and sustained new effort by the nations of the world to achieve a constructive and durable peace.

The time has come for all who work for peace and believe in peace to join in new efforts to bring the 'cold war' to an end. It must be admitted that the immediate prospects do not seem encouraging. Nevertheless, we should not delay the search for a way out of the present impasse.

We should apply to all the problems of the 'cold war' the directive of the General Assembly to the Five Great Powers and Canada on the problem of atomic energy; that is, we should 'explore all possible avenues and examine all concrete suggestions with a view to determining whether they might lead to an agreement'.

Undoubtedly it will take time and patience and much exploration

**MAGYARORSZÁGI
MUNKÁSEGYESÜLETEK
SZÖVETSÉGE**

NYILVÁNTARTÓ SZÉK: BUDAPEST, V. KER.
KALÁSZALY UTCA 24. 28.
TELEFON: 222 210 422 707

BUDAPEST, 1941. július 1.

UNION DES SYNDICATS
OUVRIERS HONGROIS

UNGARISCHER
ARBEITERSCHAFTSBUND

Méltóságos Uram!

A vezetésem alatt álló szakszervezetek helyiségeiben az utóbbi
napokban ismételtelen jelentek meg egyének s az ott tartózkodó munkáso-
kat kizárólagos törvénybe utaló cselekedetek elkövetésére kívánták
bírni. A nozzám érkezett jelentéseket mellékelve van szerencsém tisz-

Boór Aladár
főtitkár,
országgy. képviselő.



Méltóságos

Dr. Boór Aladár államtitkár urnak,

Helyben.

Facsimile of Letter (translated on page 317 of this issue)

to bring about a reduction of tensions and to set the world once more on the United Nations road to peace. . .

A United Nations programme to raise living standards can and should be planned and carried out on a non-political basis. It can and should be planned and carried out for the benefit of all humanity, without regard for the 'cold war'. . .

It should not be forgotten that the technical assistance programme was adopted unanimously by the General Assembly of the United Nations. This is not a cold war programme. It is a peace programme.

This is what the world needs. In the Specialised Agencies and the United Nations we have available all the technical, scientific and administrative skills and resources that are necessary. We have an integrated system of world organisation much more complete than the world has had before and we are learning to co-ordinate our tasks more effectively in spite of their complexity. . .

I submit that this is a wiser and more constructive course for all Governments than to continue year after year the cold war with its always increasing costs and bitterness and its implicit denial of the brotherhood of man.

I think this is the year of decision.

We must work hard to bring about this year a new beginning toward peace through the United Nations.

DAMNING EVIDENCE

[The treachery of the Hungarian Social-Democratic Party to the working class has been notorious for over a generation. The 1921 Secret Treaty with the White Terror (later fascist) régime of Horthy (with the stipulations that it would 'agree to the wishes expressed by the Prime Minister, both with regard to foreign and home policy' that it would refrain from organising agricultural workers, etc., etc.) was published in the LABOUR MONTHLY of April, 1925, a few months after the news of it had leaked out and had compelled the Second International to set up a special Commission on the matter. Recent searches in the archives in Budapest have brought to light further and damning evidence of how the Social-Democratic leaders worked hand in glove with the police against the working class members of their organisations. A selection from these newly-found documents is given below.—Ed., L.M.]

THE first is a letter in 1926 from John Vanczak, editor of *Nepszava*, the official organ of the Hungarian Social-Democratic Party, and also a member of parliament:

Budapest,
VIII, Baross-u. 15. 13.
Budapest, July 12, 1926.

Honourable Sir,
Dr. Zoltán Bencs,
Secretary to the Premier.

My Dear Sir Secretary:

For days I have been trying to reach you by telephone but I have been unable to get connected with you. I did not want to inflict myself on you personally. My colleague, Representative Nanassy, notified me today by letter that my son's case was favourably acted upon on 3rd of this month in the Interior, and the documents were sent over to the Ministry of Finance. The document has not yet gone from there to the finance directorate. I am desperate, the dark clouds of financial collapse gather over my head.

I urgently implore you to be so gracious as to have the documents taken over, expeditiously and out of turn, to the Right Honourable László Szabó in the customs house, and perhaps put in a good word for our case.

With grateful thanks for your trouble, I remain,

Yours respectfully,

János Vanczak.

Telephone number
József-3-29.

The second is a report in 1938 of the Chief of the Royal Hungarian Police to the Home Secretary:

Provincial Chief of the Hungarian Royal Police.

Subject: Important events concerning
the Social-Democratic Party.

Confidential.

Right Honourable Minister of the Interior:

On the basis of information received from a confidential person of the Hung. Royal Police in Szeged I respectfully report that on January 8 the Social-Democratic Party will hold a national conference of the Party plenum at Budapest. At this conference Ferenc Szeder, former member of parliament, and Erdélyi, the secretary of the party organisation in Debrecen, will propose that the Social-Democratic party place itself on a national basis and also withdraw—if necessary—from affiliation with the II. International. Allegedly Szeder and Erdélyi also want to remove Jewish secretaries from leadership in the party.

Budapest, 1938. December 29.

Deputy Chief of Police.

(Signature)

The third is a confidential circular from the Home Office about the views of such Social-Democratic leaders as Peyer:

Excerpt from a secret circular of the Ministry of the Interior sent to Chief of Police, mayor, etc.

No. 8782.

Budapest, May 2, 1941.

B.M. 1941

Left-wing movements.

I.

Social-Democratic Party.

According to confidential information:

1. Speakers of the Social-Democratic party continued giving political reports last week at party meetings and other gatherings.

Károly Peyer, Social Democratic member of parliament, participated in a conference of the executive held on April 28 at the workers' home in Pestszenterzsébet at Nagy Gyóri Istvan St. 2. He reported on the latest speeches of Roosevelt and Churchill. Afterwards he criticised the policy of the Soviet Union and Stalin. According to him, Stalin and his followers want to profit by this war, but in the end the Soviet Union is compelled to act according to the instructions of the German Empire. Peyer expounded also that the situation in Russia is not as flourishing as many think. He has information from diverse sources that poverty and need in Russia are so great that the Soviet Union will be unable to wage war against the axis powers. At these words the majority of the listeners began to shout that Peyer's speech could pass for extreme right-wing demagoguery.

As a result of the interruption and the clamour, order at the conference was completely disrupted and it almost turned into a fight.

The fourth document (of which a photostatic copy is reproduced in this issue) is a letter from Károly Peyer, then General Secretary of the Hungarian Trade Union Federation and Chairman of the Social-Democratic Party, sent on July 1, 1941:

The Right Honourable dr. Aladár Boór,

Under Secretary of State,
Budapest.

During the last few days individuals have repeatedly appeared at the premises of the trade unions under my leadership and attempted to persuade the workers present to commit various unlawful deeds. I have the honour to present with respect the reports I received.

Your sincere admirer,

Peyer Károly,
Member of Parliament,
General Secretary.

OPPRESSION IN INDIA

D. N. PRITT, K.C.

THROUGH the last half-century or so of British rule in India, it was pretty well known—in spite of silence or whitewashing in the British Press—that that rule was maintained against the progressive elements of the community by formidable abuses of civil liberty. It was a commonplace that many thousands of India's best citizens were interned without charge or trial for years on end, that the police beat and tortured accused persons and indeed witnesses, and that civil liberties were severely restricted; in short, that British India was a police state of the sort that is reputed to keep Mr. Ernest Bevin awake at night.

What has happened since India gained her 'freedom'? Of this, we have but little news. The British Press prints little; the Indian Press—which at one time did much to expose British abuses in India—now says little, being encouraged to that course by a system of arbitrarily-forfeitable deposits of large sums by way of guarantee, by direct censorship, and by arbitrary suspension of publication.

While there is little news easily available—there probably was never at any period in history such widespread suppression of information as we experience today from the very organs whose function is in theory to distribute it—something filters through. One gets from what does come through a general picture of the sort that objectively ought to be expected, however much easy enthusiasm or optimism might lead one to rosier hopes. India has economic difficulties, practically nothing has occurred to lessen the grip of landlords and moneylenders on her myriad agriculturists; and her towns and industries are the scene of a struggle for power between the bourgeoisies of India, U.S.A., and Britain, who are not at all calmed or reassured by events in China, Burma, Malaya, or Viet-Nam. In the circumstances, one can only expect that her government will behave towards every attempt of down-trodden workers or peasants to better their lot in the way that terrified rulers have always behaved; they have after all plenty of examples of the advantages of applying the label 'Communist' to everyone rightly struggling to be free. We must thus expect to find as little real improvement as a result of the formal change from British to Indian rule as we would get in Britain if we merely establish a Republic.

It would be helpful to give a detailed picture of the whole scene

or even of the whole field of civil liberty; but this could scarcely be done in less than a book. What can usefully be done is to cite fairly briefly two important samples of the way in which people are being treated in India at present; the first is known as the Telengana struggle, and the second as the jail-firing case. Each shows intolerable oppression; but each also shows a praiseworthy 'fight-back' on the part of the victims—and of their lawyers!

Telengana, to those who have heard of it, means one or both of two things; first, a glorious struggle to give land to the peasants, and second, a series of prosecutions amounting to persecution. It is, of course, with the latter that we are mainly concerned; but the former is part of the background, and makes good reading. I will turn to that at once. Starting several years ago, the peasants of Telengana, a poor and oppressed area in Southern Hyderabad, succeeded in liberating by what amounted to civil war, some 2,500 villages, covering an area about the size of Denmark; they distributed about one million acres of land among the landless or almost landless peasants, requisitioned the immense hoards of foods held by the landlords and money-lenders and distributed them among the starving villagers, and established a government, a system of education and a peasant militia to defend their gains. The Nizam and his forces could for long do nothing to stop them, and in the autumn of 1949 Indian troops entered Hyderabad in force. Ostensibly they came to deal with the hostility of the Nizam and his State Cabinet, and in particular with the Fascist para-military forces known as Razakars, who were tyrannising over large parts of the State. They could have, and should have, recognised the magnificent *fait accompli* of Telengana, where the Razakars had of course already been driven out. But in fact the Indian Army marched into Telengana, smashed the whole new system, killed or arrested all the leaders of the democratic movement—calling them of course Communists, for Communists always get the credit for every wholehearted blow for freedom—and put into detention some 10,000 peasants.

This brings us to the second half of the Telengana story. After the operations of the Indian Army, some hundreds of Telengana peasants were charged with murder and all sorts of other crimes, tried in batches before various special courts and in many cases sentenced to death. Both their defence on trial and their subsequent appeals have been opposed with all sorts of technical and practical difficulties, but one or two devoted lawyers in Bombay and elsewhere who have been fighting their cases under great handicaps, have achieved a remarkable measure of success, although most of

the accused as yet are by no means out of the wood—or off the scaffold—and some of the cases are already on their way to the Supreme Court of India (the successor to the Federal Court). It would be impossible to describe all the abuses of these trials, but a few of them should be stated:

The cases were conducted in English, a language unknown to the accused, and no interpreters were provided. The few lawyers available anywhere near the place of trial were also in general ignorant of English. (And this, if you please, to deal with charges of offences punishable by death.) The sums provided for counsel to defend the destitute accused were Rs.75 in each case, no matter how long the case lasted; as most of the cases were heard in a remote place, far from the railway, it often costs Rs.75 for transport; on appeals, the copy depositions necessary to the argument of the appeal, cost Rs.3 *per page*, thus often exceeding Rs.75 for this item alone. The trial court took no full or proper note of the evidence, thus hampering the appeals; from this note were omitted statements favourable to the accused, which the accused happened to hear because the witnesses spoke in Telugu, the accused's language. In a number of cases the appeal court rested its judgment on the assertion that the accused were 'members of the Communist Party, a declared illegal organisation', although the party had not been declared illegal at the time of the alleged offences. In several cases the 'first information report' had been filed *six months* after the alleged offence. (In India, where false accusations have unfortunately become prevalent through the years, the first information report is regarded as so essential a check on the genuineness of a charge that if it is not filed within 24 or 48 hours the case is regarded as normally too suspicious to support a conviction.) So much for the epic of Telengana of which more will be heard, at any rate in Courts, for some time to come.

Turning now to the 'jail-firing' cases, these present something of a minor epidemic, the symptoms of which are firing by the police on *detenus* in jails, and killing numbers of them, under circumstances where in general no reason whatever was present for such conduct. The sample I will give is known as the Sabarmati case. In this case the facts can be taken from the judgment of a Special Court at Ahmedabad, before which the surviving victims of the shooting were charged—in accordance with a practice not confined to India—with unlawful assembly, riot, and doing grievous bodily harm to those seeking to assassinate them. All but one of the men involved in this case were 'security prisoners', *detenus*, i.e., persons of political

intelligence imprisoned without charge or trial, as Pandit Nehru used to be.

The trouble originated in the prisoners being informed that a number of them were to be transferred to a jail a considerable distance away, where they would be cut off from their friends and relatives; they objected to this, especially as they suspected that it was a first step to detaining them in concentration camps instead of prisons. (Although it may be difficult for anyone who has seen an Indian prison to understand that concentration camps are in general worse than prisons, this is in fact the case.) The prisoners concerned accordingly decided to offer passive resistance to their removal, and to that end to remain together in one particular yard of the prison on the evening when they expected such transfers to begin. The jailers and police, of course, had a wholly different story, a fantastic yarn of the type only too often accepted by criminal courts, to the effect that the prisoners were armed with sticks, barricaded themselves in, wore masks, and threatened the poor jailers with violence, and attacked them for *three and a half hours* with showers of stones and brickbats (of which no doubt a supply would be conveniently furnished in the prison). The prisoners offered such resistance, the story went, that police reinforcements were called for, and duly arrived; that when the police entered the yard where the prisoners were, they were received with a volley of stones, brickbats and pieces of wood, and some of them were seriously injured, and indeed, they and the jailers were forced to retreat! Finally, 'to save the situation', and to protect themselves from being killed or seriously injured, they had to fire on the prisoners. Two prisoners were killed and a number seriously injured. The account given by the prisoners, however, was that they had indeed assembled in the yard to offer passive resistance, but that the rest of the prosecution's story was a pack of lies, and that in truth they were the victims of a sudden and unprovoked attack by a large body of police armed with rifles and jail sepoys armed with lathis and batons, who beat up systematically those of the prisoners who had not been shot.

The triumph of the prisoners in the prosecution was complete. The Special Judge before whom they were tried fairly and properly found that they constituted an unlawful assembly, since they had gathered together for the common purpose of resisting removal, but he completely demolished the prosecution's story by finding that none of the prisoners had been guilty of riot, or had used any force or violence except in the legitimate defence of their own limbs and life, or had injured any policeman or jailer! He could and did only

do this by in effect convicting the prosecution witnesses of wholesale perjury; and he expressly found that much of their evidence was 'concocted and false'. This called for a good deal of moral courage on the part of the Special Judge, and is a very heartening incident which has certainly postponed the establishment of concentration camps and may even go so far as to discourage the indiscriminate shooting of prisoners (even when they are admittedly Communists!). But it is not the only bright feature of the case, for the conduct of the defence itself was something which, in the tense and difficult conditions of today, reflects credit on the legal profession, or at any rate on the members of that profession who conducted the case, in a degree which we only rarely see. This is what the defending counsel said in his final speech, appearing for Communists accused of violent action against the police:

'I cannot circumscribe myself only to the codified laws of the country nor to the volumes of journals on criminal law. I will rely on numerous scriptures whose authors are none others than the rulers of India today. Since the days I was a student, Pandit Jawaharlal has dinned it into my ears . . .

A State which has to rule by ordinances and emergency legislatures has no right to exist even for a moment; a State which does not represent the will of the people must be thrown out.

'The question, therefore, before us is: Does the Government today rule by ordinance and emergency legislations or not? Does the Government today really represent the will of the people? Even a child knows today how our rulers are ruling over us. The most hated Public Security Measures Act—popularly known as the Public Insecurity Measures Act—reduces us to slavery and servility. We are at the mercy of petty executive officers; ruled by the police no better than in a Fascist State. These gentlemen in the docks have declared, and rightfully so, a war against such a State. They may succeed sooner rather than later. Till the time they succeed, they might be painted by the vested interests as saboteurs, fifth columnists, traitors, mutineers, etc. Were not the rulers of today dubbed the same by the rulers of those days? The day these gentlemen succeed, they will be honoured as the real fighters for freedom and social justice. It is only the brave who fight the war of Independence. It may be the war of American Independence; it may be the Great Russian Revolution. . . The accused say that they are detained under a tyrannical law. And they agree with Jefferson who said: "Resistance to tyranny is obedience to God". Our God is our people. Therefore we shall repeat: "Resistance to tyranny is obedience to the will of the people".

‘Now I will tell you, My Lord, why is this such an important issue? Our fight is not against a transfer from one town to the other. It is not so small an issue. Our fight is a fight against any attempt at opening Concentration Camps. What are these Concentration Camps? They were the products of the perverted brains of Fascist brutes. In these camps, hundreds of thousands of men were tortured and burnt to death. They remind us of the days when man knew no civilisation. We shall fight to the last drop of blood in our bodies against this attempt of revival of barbarism. When one hears of the atrocities in the Concentration Camps, like the Scuzuchim Camp, etc., one’s blood boils. One feels that he must fight such an attempt. This fight is a fight for freedom, social justice, and lasting peace. . .

‘Where there is a cold-blooded conspiracy to trample on our rights, to commit murders, we would be justified in even aggressive resistance. What else was this but a conspiracy on the part of those who are playing the pious rôle of accusing us today? Let me analyse the act of the police and the Government. Let me tell you what happened on the night of the 13th and what were the factors guiding these operations. I do not want to shock you when I say that the incident of the 13th night which was enacted in a prison in one of the towns of this country was a part and parcel of the international conspiracy of the forces of reaction to suppress all that is progressive, to suppress the Communists who are fighting for progress, social justice and lasting peace. Our rulers are mere puny players in that world-wide game led by the Anglo-American bloc. . .

‘Let us now see who are our accusers and what are their stakes. In the forefront, my accuser is the Government. And the Government has a very high political stake in this case. Its entire prestige, its very existence almost rests on the results of this case. The police officers are my accusers. Look at the high personal stake involved in this case. They know if they fail in proving their innocence, anyhow they will be kicked out of their jobs. The jail officers are another set of my accusers. Theirs is also a high personal stake. We say, these are the conspirators and murderers. And yet they are my accusers today. They are the witnesses against me. (All the material witnesses are interested witnesses.) They are the investigators of the crime. They are the manufacturers of all documents and evidence against me. They are the fabricators of lies.

‘Look at these brave accused—Jayanti, the youngest member of the Dandi March, the chosen of Mahatma Gandhi, a brave son of the country. Every one of them has a history of glorious fights and sacrifices. They are among the accused men who could roll in luxur-

ies, who could earn moneys in a day which Your Honour or I could not be able to see even in our lifetime. They are men with the highest ideals and the finest sentiments. Only Communists are capable of these. What are they doing all these things for? For their personal pleasures? Or, for power? There are some who would have occupied the highest places of power. They have spurned all this. They are fighting a noble cause. On their side is the cause of truth, social justice and lasting peace. On the other is the cause of stark reaction and guilty conscience.

‘ This is what Jawaharlal himself said a few years back :

But of one thing I am quite sure, that no new order can be built up in India so long as the spirit of the I.C.S. pervades our administration and our public services. That spirit of authoritarianism is the ally of imperialism, and it cannot co-exist with freedom. It will either succeed in crushing freedom or will be swept away itself. Only with one type of State is it likely to fit in, and that is the fascist type. Therefore it seems to me quite essential that the I.C.S. and similar services must disappear completely, as such, before we can start real work on a new order. (Autobiography by Jawaharlal Nehru, p. 445.)

(Are these gentlemen not justified in saying that they lived under a fascist Raj?)

In every democratic country today there is an argument going on as to whether radical economic changes can be brought about in the ordinary course through the constitutional machinery at their disposal. Many people are of opinion that this cannot be done, and some unusual and revolutionary method will have to be adopted. For our purpose in India the issue of this argument is immaterial, for we have no constitutional means of bringing about the changes we desire. Their progress in many directions will be stopped completely. There is no way out except by revolution or illegal action. What then is one to do? Give up all idea of change and resign oneself to fate?

The position today in India is even more extraordinary. The Executive can and does prevent or restrict all manner of public activities. Any activity that is, in its opinion, dangerous for it is prohibited. Thus all effective public activity can be stopped, as it was stopped during the last three years. Submission to this means giving up all public work. That is an impossible position to take up.

No one can say that he will always and without fail act legally. Even in a democratic state occasions may arise when one's conscience compels one to act otherwise. In a despotically or arbitrarily governed country these occasions are bound to be more frequent; indeed, in such a state the law loses all moral justification. (Autobiography, p. 424.)

‘ The accused resisted reactionary and brute force like brave men. Their grief is not that a few persons received injuries. Their grief is

that they could not properly deal a blow to these brutal forces. They are proud of their comrades who died fighting. They are proud of the injuries that they have received. These injuries will be the mementoes of their brave deeds. These are the black deeds of the Government which make anyone's blood boil. The Government is labouring under an illusion that it can put down Communism by these methods. Only the other day, after this incident, no less a person than the erstwhile President of the I.N. Congress, Acharya Kripalani, said this:

Communism can be put down by jailing and shooting as little as our movement was put down by such methods. Let us practise in prosperity what we learnt in adversity. (Bharat Jyoti, 23.10.1949.)

'My Lord, this trial will go down in the history not only of this Province but of the whole country. I am proud of these brave young men whom I am defending. It is my privilege to defend them. It is Your Honour's privilege to try them. The trial will go down in the history of the people's struggle for freedom. It is Your Honour's opportunity to choose. Let the verdict be written in letters of gold.'

If this courageous lawyer had had the advantage of living in a 'free democracy' like the U.S.A., he would have been in jail himself, for contempt of court, before he had even finished his speech!

LAZLO RUDAS (1885—1950)

Lazlo Rudas, who died on April 29 at the age of 65, was one of the oldest and most valued contributors to the LABOUR MONTHLY. His articles on Dialectical Materialism, published in 1933, were widely appreciated and, in response to requests, were reprinted as a pamphlet.

Rudas, active in the working class movement from 1903, was one of the founders in 1918 of the Hungarian Communist Party. After the defeat of the workers' revolution in 1919 he continued activities as a political refugee in several countries. Then in the Soviet Union he became widely known as a writer, teacher, and propagandist of Marxism-Leninism. After a quarter of a century abroad, he lived to see the triumph of the Hungarian people over their exploiters and oppressors: and then in these last five years of the Hungarian People's Republic he played a leading part in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism.

FASCIST OVERTURE—II

JAMES KLUGMANN

SINCE the Communists were removed from the French Government in 1947, by the socialist Ramadier, on American instructions, the national police budget has gone up from 29 to 79 milliard francs—an increase of 170 per cent. The Paris municipal police, alone, has increased its annual expenditure from six to 23 milliard francs. But with all the police, never have the figures for theft, murder and common crime been so high. For the police are not concerned with thieves or assassins—except insofar as the murder of striking or demonstrating workers is concerned. In November, 1947, the Socialist Minister of the Interior, Jules Moch, took the initiative in using troops against striking workers. Since this day, with successive Governments, it has become a habit. The officers trained in the French Resistance are being purged from the Army and replaced by the old collaborationists. The French left-wing press is denied access to the soldiers' barracks where the U.S. press of reaction circulates freely. Resistance fighters are imprisoned on trumped-up charges, whilst Pétainists, Cagoullards, and other Quislings are amnestied. Under the ægis of de Gaulle's 'Rally of the French People' and with the complicity of the M.R.P. and right-wing socialists, the old fascist leagues with their motorised and combat squads are being restored.

It was a tradition of French democracy that the largest Party should form the Government. When the Communist Party became the largest this tradition was discarded. 'Legality kills us', say the trusts. The French electoral system allowed the French Communists to be widely represented in Parliament, therefore the electoral system has to be revised. 'Legality kills us', say the trusts. The new post-war Constitution was an advance in capitalist democracy compared with the pre-war constitution, therefore the Constitution must be changed. 'Legality kills us'. And now the way has to be cleared for de Gaulle and more open fascist rule. The right-wing M.R.P. and socialist leaders open the road to the Gaullists and the Gaullists undertake to restore to office the old Quislings who once turned France over to Hitler, and now offer it up to U.S. imperialism. The Gaullist Colonel Remy writes (in *Carrefour*, 11.4.50) calling for the release of Pétain and his supporters:

You must remember that France has always had two strings to her bow. In June, 1940, she needed the Pétain string as well as the de Gaulle string.

If the (Pétain) trial were held again *today*, he would not be condemned, nor those who follow him.

The old Quislings are needed to stem the democratic demands of the French people. The old Quislings, therefore, must be released from gaol, and French trade unionists must take their place.

In Italy, too, the Communist Ministers were removed from office on Wall Street demand. Italy, as well as France, is, according to Wall Street plans, to become a U.S. war-base, part of the secure 'rear' of the U.S.-dominated army of anti-Soviet aggression. So in Italy, too, despite the long years of misery of Mussolini's rule, fascism has to be restored. De Gasperi and the Christian Democrat leaders are paving the way for the return of fascism. The police of Scelba, Minister of the Interior, are set loose to attack the Italian workers and peasants fighting for bread, land and peace. *Terra e non guerra*—'land, not war'—is a 'subversive' call for De Gasperi and his masters. The demand of the Italian workers for work is a 'subversive' appeal. That is why the workers of Modena or the poor peasants of Sicily and the south are being fired on and assassinated. As in France, the Italian Government has recently brought in a series of decree-laws authorising local authorities and prefects to forbid meetings and processions, prohibiting meetings inside the factories without the permission of the employer, forbidding house to house sale of papers by voluntary groups. The laws directly violate the post-war Italian Constitution. 'Legality kills us', say the trusts. With the direct complicity of Scelba's police, the old fascist leagues are being restored, above all in the form of the M.S.I. (Italian Social Movement). The Italian Constitution forbids the rebirth of fascism *in any form*. But 'legality kills us'; the M.S.I., helped by the police, armed with truncheons and guns imported from the U.S., attack workers' and peasants' meetings, press offices, clubs. Some months ago in Puglia during an open fascist celebration fascists and police jointly attacked the workers' counter-demonstration. A few days earlier, a Milan fascist paper, addressing its supporters in Puglia, wrote:

This time *you* must be the first to fire . . . make an agreement with the police and keep contact with them . . . don't let the Communists pass in Puglia. If they raise their heads let it be for the last time.

We would do very wrong to labour under the illusion that the same process of fascisation is not taking place in Britain. Though the forms are more cunningly concealed, the process is the same.

The attempt to prohibit unofficial strikes (dockers), to make arbitration compulsory (Order 1305) is part of the process. The banning

of May Day processions, traditional of the Labour movement, on the pretext of a meeting of 200 Mosleyites, is part of the process. The use of troops to break strikes; the police attack on workers' demonstrations and the enormous efforts to protect the Mosley-fascists from the wrath of the people who thought that in World War II they were fighting to eliminate fascism, is part of this process, too.

The various purge measures introduced by a Labour Government when no Tory Government had ever dared to introduce them, are part of the process. The red-baiting campaign, together with the removal from office of democratically elected trade union officials, is part of this process of softening up. When capitalist democracy permits the advance of the militant workers, then democracy, according to the trusts, must be sacrificed. 'Legality kills us'. The red-baiting exhortations of Lord Vansittart, when Communist, Labour and Conservative, priest, officer and journalist are exposed to false accusation against which they have no appeal, are part of this same process. The removal of Mr. Andrew Rothstein from his post of lecturer at the School of Slavonic Studies on the peculiar pretext of 'inadequate scholarship' is part of the same process that resulted in the removal of Frédéric Joliot-Curie and Professor Teissler in France.

As the war preparations swing ahead, and as more and more people swing into action in the battle for peace and living standards, the real representatives of the monopolists turn against even the restricted rights and liberties of British capitalist democracy. Under cover of anti-communism they turn against the people. Scrutator writes in the *Sunday Times* (30.4.50) commenting on the Australian anti-Communist Bill:

Something of the kind will eventually be necessary here, whether we decide to ban the Communist Party or to ban unofficial strikes.

The development of the attacks in the capitalist world against the rights and liberties of the working class and the people brings out once again with striking clarity the lessons of the Weimar Republic.

Right-wing social democrats who side with reaction in the red-baiting campaign, right-wing trade union leaders, shamefaced Liberals, even Conservatives—all those who can be an obstacle to the war plans of the great monopolists—are knocked off one after the other. Right-wing German socialist and trade union leaders sided with reaction in the attack on German Communists, so did republican, church and centrist leaders. When fascism was brought to power they were rewarded for the weakness and complicity with the same

concentration camp as the German Communists. Today in America, under cover of red-baiting, the Communists are first attacked, then the trade unions, then the New Dealers, Fair-Dealers, all real democrats and lovers of peace. In Australia, the right-wing labour and trade union leaders initiated the red-baiting campaign. Now Mr. Menzies menaces the Labour leader, Mr. Chifley, and threatens to secure his majority in the Senate by 'declaring' some Labour members. *There is no escape in complicity.* Tories and Wall Street attack Mr. Strachey and Mr. Shinwell as dangerous 'security risks'. Lord Vansittart extends the offensive to all and sundry who might one day at some time have forgotten to attack the Soviet Union. As Henry Wallace declared when the U.S. Communist leaders were indicted in 1948:

Defence of the civil rights of Communists is the first line in the defence of the liberties of a democratic people. The history of Germany, Italy, Japan and Franco Spain should teach us that the suppression of the Communists is but the first step in an assault on the democratic rights of labour, national, racial and political minorities and all those who oppose the policies of the government in power.

But the drive of the great monopolists and of their governments to open dictatorship—towards fascism—is being met with growing resistance—with ever greater working class unity—and unity of all sections of the working people. In the U.S. not only Communists, but more and more of the members and organisations of the C.I.O. and A.F.L., farmers, teachers, the organisations of the Negro people, Jewish organisations, minority groupings, and honest Republicans and Democrats are fighting back against the iniquitous Mundt Bill. In Australia labour unity is being forged from below in the struggle against the repressive Menzies Government. In South Africa a united struggle is being waged by Africans and white workers against the Malan Government, drawing in elements from more conservative opinion. In Italy and France working class unity under Communist leadership and the unity of workers and peasants are forcing governments of reaction, despite their desperate manœuvres and their police brutality, to retreat.

The world movement for peace, growing in width and activity, is a blow also to those who want to prepare for war by instituting repression at home. But more and more clearly it stands out that the defence of democratic liberties, even within the capitalist states, can only be waged successfully under the leadership of the working class, on whose shoulders the main responsibility falls in the fight against fascism as in the fight against war. Lenin pointed out that:

It would be a fundamental mistake to suppose that the struggle for democracy can divert the proletariat from the socialist revolution or obscure or overshadow it, etc. On the contrary, just as socialism cannot be victorious unless it introduces complete democracy, so the proletariat will be unable to prepare for victory over the bourgeoisie unless it wages a many-sided, consistent and revolutionary battle for democracy.

(Selected Works, Vol. V, p. 268.)

The working class has the decisive responsibility in the struggle against fascism. Dmitrov, explaining in 1935 the attitude of Communists to the struggle, declared:

We are not anarchists, and it is not at all a matter of indifference to us what kind of political régime exists in a given country, whether a bourgeois dictatorship in the form of bourgeois democracy, even with democratic rights and liberties greatly curtailed, or a bourgeois dictatorship in its open, fascist form.

Being upholders of Soviet democracy, we shall defend every inch of the democratic gains made by the working class in the course of years of stubborn struggle, and shall resolutely fight to extend these gains.

The fight to defend the democratic gains of the working class and to extend them is, today, in the light of the developing war preparations of imperialism, a key aspect of the fight for peace. The trusts, Tories and right-wing Labour leaders are preparing for aggressive war and at the same time trying to 'secure their rear' by all manner of fascist measures. But fascism is no more inevitable than war if the working class takes the lead in the fight against it and rallies to the struggle the whole mass of the people.

Book Reviews

HANNINGTON'S BRILLIANT BOOK

Mr. Chairman! By Wal Hannington.
(137 pp. Lawrence and Wishart,
3s. (d.))

'MR. CHAIRMAN!' How many times and in what various circumstances and conditions have I heard those two words used? Now Wal Hannington has written a short guide to the conduct and procedure of meetings. In short, he explains in commonsense language what is supposed to happen when a member of an audience, especially a working class audience, says, 'Mr. Chairman!' It is simple and easy to understand, but this is not surprising when the experience of the author is borne in mind.

I have known him as the leader of the first hunger march when rules of conduct had not yet been worked out and had to be improvised to meet each unprecedented situation. During this hunger march of 1922 Wally learned the importance of Rules, which up to then he had probably held in contempt. His work as Secretary of the International Class War Prisoners' Aid compelled him to instruct ever-changing chairmen on the importance of the proper conduct of meetings, most of which were concerned with raising funds. This is where he learned, for the first time, the art of extracting monies from a sympathetic audience for a worthy cause and how important it was to have a chairman in accord with the purpose of the meeting.

I remember in 1927 when he came to South Wales to organise the first miners' march to London. The 1926 struggle had passed with its due consequences for the workers who had engaged in it.

Unemployment, victimisation, imprisonment, these represented the fate of thousands of Welsh miners. Then along came Wal Hannington

with the offer to lead the march for work and bread. I well recall, as a member of the Marchers' Council, how Wal insisted upon rules of conduct and how he operated as the Chairman of that Council. Of course, among those 260-odd desperate men who undertook the adventure in the face of the ban of the T.U.C., which was intended to force the marchers to retreat through starvation and hardship, there were undisciplined persons who 'could not take it' when things got tough. It was in this experience he learned how to apply previously agreed Rules, irrespective of consequences. How well I remember the incident at Swindon when A. J. Cook, who had joined the marchers with John Strachey, the Editor of *The Miner*, appealed for lenience for an individual which, had it been granted, might have broken all control and discipline for the remainder of the march. Wal said 'No', and we, the members of the Marchers' Council, backed him, and on many occasions before his death I heard A.J., who was my very close personal friend, say how right Wally was.

There was an incident on this march which I think should be told to show that even the author had feet of clay. We were sitting at the roadside having the mid-day meal from our travelling kitchen, which was in the charge of an ex-cook of the 1914-18 war. He had lost a leg and wore a wooden peg. He came from Dowlais and was used to 'Army in the field' methods, and I wish here to pay my compliments to him for according to his lights he did his best. However, it turned out that marcher after marcher, all of whom had sworn not to complain, came to Wally and me to explain that they could not eat the stew. Wally brushed all complaints aside as idle grousing. I should explain that the Marchers' Council, according to Resolution, was served after the men. When our turn came all seemed fine, until the spoons entered our mouths.

The taste was execrable. Petrol was the main ingredient, or so we thought. The troops were justified, so we sent for the cook, who calmly explained that a petrol can had spilled over the vegetables and to avoid destroying them he wiped them. He explained that this was the method in the field of battle and he considered this was a comparable situation. Waste was not permissible. This was the occasion when Wal's knowledge of chairmanship was really tested. He did the correct thing. He apologised to the assembled marchers before the cook, took a motion from a member and then accepted another resolution that we accept two hours' delay so that the petrol-soaked food could be buried in a nearby field and another meal be prepared.

I could go on indefinitely about this comrade's knowledge of propaganda, agitation and disciplined, organised Trade Union work. He reminds me of Tom Mann, the greatest agitator of the past century. In attention to detail he has no superior—no letter was left unanswered for more than 24 hours, however trivial. It certainly amazes me that this man, Wally Hannington, should have so many qualities which are said to be conflicting in one person. Yet he has them. His book on chairmanship has been born out of the most varied experiences that any single person has undergone.

In *Mr. Chairman!* the fruit of this rich experience is made available to all sections of our movement. All who appreciate the necessity for the fair and efficient conduct of meetings, whether new recruit or seasoned official, will find here careful and clear definitions of terms, rules and procedure at meetings, with commonsense advice as to their application. Different types of meetings, from Trade Union Branch to Delegate Conference, are described and the powers and duties of a chairman are explained according to the form and purpose of the meeting. Helpful

suggestions are given, not only about the conduct of meetings, but also their preparation. Wal Hannington knows the 'rules of the game' as few others; he has explained them simply and reasonably; he would have them applied not with the barren intention of adhering to forms of procedure for their own sake, but to facilitate smooth and efficient conduct of affairs. Armed with this unpretentious little book, brilliant in its simplicity, members and officials of working class organisations and representatives on public bodies can play their parts with confidence, for they will know not only 'how' but 'why'.

In the March, in Branch Meetings, in National Councils, Wally has been in all situations and he has placed his experience at the behest of all workers reaching towards service for the working classes in any sphere. He believes in democratic rules and in obedience to them.

ARTHUR L. HORNER

HOMO SAPIENS

The Human Species: A Biology of Man. By Anthony Barnett. (280 pp. MacGibbon and Kee, 18s.)

THIS is an informative and stimulating book which can be read easily and with great enjoyment. Most books on biology have the drawback for the general reader that they are either too abstract and philosophical or too much in the nature of a more or less elementary textbook remote from social implications, or they are imbued with reactionary social views. This book is not explicitly Marxist, its account of biological theories does not go beyond views commonly accepted in this country, it is open to criticism on some points of fact and formulation, but this is outweighed by its many great merits. Firstly, it is written in a simple,

readable style and does not assume special knowledge on the part of the reader. Secondly, it is by no means just a compilation of elementary textbook facts but deals freshly with vitally important problems and views them in the light of up-to-date knowledge. Thirdly, the emphasis throughout is on social aspects, on the relation of biological knowledge to human needs. Fourthly, and very important, it is the work of a writer with a progressive outlook, who is not afraid of the progressive conclusions that can be drawn in each sphere treated and which are being forced on natural scientists by the advance of biological knowledge. Finally, the book is well produced with many good photographs and fine diagrams in colour.

The book is divided into three main sections dealing respectively with heredity, human diversity and questions of food, population and health. The first section is the shortest, the most 'orthodox' in its treatment of heredity from the standpoint of the chromosome theory, and the most open to criticism in its formulations. It is true that two pages are devoted to Lysenko, but the account of his view is by no means adequate and also gives the effect of an open-minded pedagogue, who avoids committing himself by saying 'we must await the results of further study'. In regard to the relative importance of nature and nurture, the author concludes that 'no general answer is possible, but only a number of particular answers'. He does point out that 'from the point of view of getting something useful achieved then the answer must put the emphasis on the environment' but he qualifies it by saying that 'this applies only when man is being considered'.

The second section deals with man as a product of evolution, the latest evidence on fossil man and the existing diversity of races. It also discusses such subjects as race

theory, the inheritance of intelligence, mixed breeding, eugenics and equality between the sexes. The author here comes out strongly against the upholders of race or class superiority. On the contrary view the emancipation of large sections of mankind would be unfortunate. But as the author concludes 'there is every reason to think that once depressed races and classes are set on the road of social development, they will soon make a contribution to the material and intellectual wealth of mankind commensurate with their numbers'.

The third section makes up almost half the book and is especially devoted to the two major biological problems of food production and disease. The starting point of the chapter on Food and the Soil is given by the quotation at its head from Karl Marx: 'All progress in agriculture is a progress... in the art of robbing the soil; all progress in increasing the fertility of the soil for a given time is a progress towards raising the lasting sources of that fertility'. The author gives an excellent treatment of such subjects as the balance of nature, feeding the world, overcoming erosion and the requirements for improvements of agriculture. He rebuffs the pessimists and Malthusians and notes that the world food problem is largely one of the transformation of world agriculture from a system of small-scale peasant farming with primitive methods to one of communal farming in which full use is made of scientific knowledge. 'If we fail', he says, 'the failure will be a social and political one and not a consequence of something inherent in nature and unalterable'.

The chapters on food and diet and on the fight against pestilence and disease are excellent summaries and make full allowance for environmental factors. The final chapter stresses that biology as a science is not the work of a few inspired minds but has developed in

close relation to human needs and its progress depends especially on the social structure of society. Under modern conditions large-scale planning is essential and this depends above all on (1) the combined efforts of an educated population and (2) the absence of privileged minorities. These are conditions that are incompatible with capitalism.

C. P. DUTT

WATSON OF NEW ZEALAND

Gordon Watson, His Life and Writings. By Elsie Locke. (245 pp. The New Zealand Communist Party, 10s.)

Here is a record of a life well spent in the cause of humanity. He met his death in battle during the New Zealanders' last battle in Italy towards the end of the Second World War. Citation—Killed in action—Private Clement Gordon Watson, of Wellington. So a brave heart ceased to beat and a great loss fell upon New Zealand when this brilliant intelligence was no more. This volume, edited by his comrade Elsie Locke, bears testimony by friends and comrades to his greatness and his modesty.

Born in 1912, killed in 1945, Gordon had a crowded adult life. Son of a farmer; grandson of a famous educator, one of the founders of New Zealand Educational Institute, 'his career at Wellington College would read like a catalogue of prizes and scholarship for literary work, languages and history'. At Victoria College he won his M.A., but his questioning mind, appalled at the misery occasioned by the slump of the 'thirties, kept seeking for an answer to why such things could be, and with seeking, found it. Thenceforth for Gordon, the cloistered serenity of the University had to give way to the stern fight to end poverty and

injustice. He found his way to Marxism much influenced by our *Labour Monthly*. A trip to Europe and the U.S.S.R. in 1936 strengthened his convictions. He edited the *New Zealand Workers' Weekly*, which in 1939 was renamed *The People's Voice*, whose present editor, Sid Scott, said of him, 'He had the rare combination of qualities of heart and mind which fitted him to render service in the noblest of all tasks—the liberation of mankind'. Elaine Dutt said, 'He gave his life for those ideals and aspirations for whose victory he had already done so much in his intense, all-too-short years of activity'.

This memorial volume presents a selection of his poems from his student days and others which were written during war service. I have only space for a few lines of *Dedication*, culled from the magazine of the 36th Battalion, N.Z. Army Pacific Theatre of War, 1944:

These were our authors,
The broken night and the dawn patrol
The fellowship of the tent,
The limping feet and the pounding heart,
Fever and punishment.
Mud-slobbered trucks and green-painted men
Jesting and salty speech
Letters from home and the grinding barge
And the dead on the beach.

The prose selections contain controversial articles fighting reaction in University circles, such as *Would you be a Special*, addressed to students who were being paraded with batons and helmets, soldiers against their own countrymen and more shameful, against their own class. Gordon was a devoted and active friend of the Soviet people, as shown in the article *Kirov was a Workers' Leader*. In the fight for peace and against Fascism, Gordon's articles from the *Workers' Press* were trenchant, potent and can be read with great ad-

vantage at this moment when all that he and his comrades-in-arms fought and died for is once again imperilled by profit-hungry Atomaniacs who hope to succeed where Hitler failed. I commend this tribute to a great soldier of Communism to intellectual and proletarian, for each can learn much from Gordon Watson to assist them in our present fight to prevent further war and further losses of such brilliant, devoted servants and leaders of our cause.

BOB STEWART

KINDS OF FREEDOM

Communism and Liberty. By Rodney Hilton. (32 pp. Marxism Today Series, Lawrence and Wishart, 1s. 6d.)

WHILE General MacArthur slashes at the liberties so recently granted at Potsdam to the Japanese, and half-a-dozen other countries at the U.S. War Department's behest, follow suit; and while Hollywood writers and American progressives are incarcerated in Federal jails in growing numbers, Mr. Acheson, of the State Department, makes speeches to the Senate on the 'Soviet denial of fundamental human rights'. Worse still, Acheson's propaganda line, widely repeated, has succeeded, though only temporarily, in confusing the minds and numbing the activities of numbers who would otherwise be on the march against the greatest attack on human liberties since Hitler's.

Rodney Hilton's essay is thus directed at clarifying one of the most fundamental of our contemporary problems. He exposes the hypocrisy of the modern preachers of inhumanity and thought control, and of their social-democratic errand boys who go before them with fig leaves. He tears down the false abstraction of 'authority' and 'the individual' with which many would-be political theorists deceive themselves and others, and the consequential false definition of

liberty as 'absence of restraint' which paves the fatal path to the tomb on the ivory tower. Surveying the question with the eye of an historian, for him liberty is 'positive rights and privileges' won in successive class struggles. The conception of what composes liberty expands in the process, through feudal and bourgeois liberties to the infinitely more extended liberties of the working class dictatorship and the splendid liberties of Communism, to which it is the gate. He examines both quantitative and qualitative extensions of liberty.

Seeing Marxism as 'a movement which promises hope for humanity' Mr. Hilton does not hesitate to ask for action. One could wish that he had space along with 'liberty' to examine 'democracy'. But be that as it may, here is a guide to half of our present controversies, whether in the press or by the fireside.

ARTHUR CLEGG

ANTI-COMMUNIST HANDBOOK

The Theory and Practice of Communism. By R. N. Carew Hunt (232 pp. Geoffrey Bles. 12s. 6d.)

THE study of Communism has become obligatory for the bourgeoisie in its old age. In contrast to the previous ostrich policy of silence, Short Courses in Marxism have now become part of the standard equipment of the officials of imperialism to arm them for their 'cold war' and in preparation for the plans of a third world war. The United States Committee on Foreign Affairs has put out its *Strategy and Tactics of World Communism*. Similarly a Whitehall 'Inter-departmental Committee' sponsored this pemmicanised police version of Marxism, which was originally issued for the use of diplomats, staff officers, civil servants and police agents, and is now made available for the general public.

However, to play with Marxism is to play with fire. It might prove dangerous to allow naïve politically untrained generals, budding diplomats or youthful secret service agents to come into direct contact with the plain and powerful writings of Marx, Lenin or Stalin. Hence the myth is sedulously maintained that these are too 'heavy reading' (p. 135) for the average reader; and in their place is offered an ounce of banal, vulgarised, distorted 'summary' alongside a ton of trivial venomous comment, 'refutation' and slander. Principal 'authorities' quoted are Max Eastman, Bertrand Russell, Koestler, Popper, Plamenatz, Kingsley Martin, Ruth Fischer and the rest of the gallery of fashionable anti-communist scribes.

Typical pearls of wisdom may give a taste of the character of the book:

Strictly speaking there are no such persons as Communists, because nowhere, not even in Russia, has Communism yet been achieved. (p. 5.)

Communism . . . is ultimately driven to appeal to certain propositions which have to be accepted by faith . . . since a belief in the propositions upon which science rests requires an act of faith like any other. (p. 6.)

It is no accident that so many of the Communist leaders from Marx's day onwards have been Jews. (p. 9.)

Marx's system is a return to the animism of primitive man, which attributes human values to trees and other material objects. (p. 30.)

The Marxist version of the class struggle is in fact a myth. (p. 40.)

Under Stalin Marxism was grafted on to the Asiatic-Byzantine tradition. (p. 169.)

The crushing exposure of this farago of distortion, ignorance and gross errors of fact by Emile Burns in the *Daily Worker* (May 4, 1950) makes any further review unnecessary.

R.P.D.

SHORTER NOTICE

London—May Day, 1950. New Era Films. 16 mm. and 8 mm. 12 minutes. Silent.

BEFORE the London Trades Council, meeting on June 8th in the Beaver Hall, the film *London—May Day, 1950*, received its world premiere. Made as a voluntary contribution to the Labour Movement by 13 film technicians, members of New Era Cine Club, the film records movingly but with restraint and objectivity the May Day demonstration of the London Trades Council, the police violence before and after the meeting in Trafalgar Square, the official protection for the tiny band of fascists in the East End, on whose behalf all demonstrations were banned. Available on hire or purchase in 16mm. or 8 mm. versions through the London Trades Council or direct from New Era, the film is a worthy record of the courage and determination of thousands of London workers on that day. Its production signals the development of a new, powerful propaganda weapon in the cause of peace and the British working class movement. P.S.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

Co-operatives in Poland. Gordon Schaffer. "New Poland." 6d. 18 pp.
 Eyewitness: Peekskill, U.S.A. Westchester Cttee. for a Fair Inquiry into the Peekskill Violence. U.S.A.
 Report of the Proceedings of the Second World Trade Union Congress. World Federation of Trade Unions. 81. 760 pp.
 Report of Activity of World Federation of Trade Unions, October, 1945 - April, 1949. W.F.T.U. 81. 486 and 118 pp.
 Commonsense About Russia. Pat Sloan. British Soviet Friendship Society. 16 pp. 3d.
 The Yankee Occupation of Canada. Tim Buck. Labor-Progressive Party, Canada. 16 pp. 3 cents.

A STERN REALITY

Although this month not many new readers came forward paying 1s. to stand-in for some town from which no regular donations are received, some have stepped up to rescue their home town from another reader's patronage and transfer it to the steady money group. Thus a serviceman rescues Taunton; J.F. puts Aberdeen in the steady money for a year, and a U.S. reader does the same for New York. Says an Englishwoman: 'I don't like to see Philadelphia in the red; I have vivid memories of my visit there, the green-lawned homes on the one side of the track and the crowded houses where Negro and white workers live on the other side. So here's 1s. for Philadelphia, for one month'. But no one has yet come to the rescue of Boston, Los Angeles, Chicago and San Francisco. As to last month's low total, plenty of readers show anxiety about that. From Hungerford: 'Regret I can't send more, but the month's fund was very low and I don't like to see that. Perhaps the enclosed stamps will help a little?' And 'L'Humanité' sends 'a bit over my usual'. Another old faithful writes: 'I wish I could step up my contribution, but "fair shares for all" seems to have slipped somewhere. We find the basic cost of living rising steadily and no chance of increasing our income. Couldn't some readers who don't contribute regularly give the price of a packet of fags or a pint of beer occasionally?' From Glasgow: 'Here's 5s. from H.M. Collector of taxes to myself, now passed to you!' From U.S.: 'I'm so sorry not to be able to contribute; but unemployment is becoming a stern reality here'. An echo, from an Ilford subscriber: 'Owing to irregularity of employment, I have to get my copy singly at news-stands for the present. But here's 3s.' The May total shows only a very small improvement, at

£29 14s. 6d.

STAND-IN MONEY came from:

D. Mayo, standing in for Plymouth and Rottingdean, 2s; 'Bath', standing in for Aylesbury, Cardiff, Totnes, Warwick and Watford, 5s; 'Exeter', standing in for Birmingham, Crediton, Dublin, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Norwich, Swansea, Turton (Lancs.) and Weymouth, 8s.

STEADY MONEY guarantees came from:

J. Tuckett, 1s 6d, and 'Manchester', 1s; C.B., 'Bristol', 1s 6d; 'Bath', 5s; Anon., 'Whitechurch', 1s; R.J.R., 'Ipswich', 1s; 'Leicester', 5s; 'Belfast' (prepaid); Tom Brown, 'Ilfracombe', 7s; 'Exeter', 2s; D. Mayo, 10s; D. Rees, 10s; T. Flood, 5s; E. D. McCallum, 5s; H.G.B., 2s; J. and K. Ekevall, 7s 6d; Royston Green, 3s 6d; D. M. Clarke, 10s; G. E. and M. F. A. Philibert, 5s; L. Rowan, 6s; H. N. Humphreys, 3s 6d; 'L'Humanité', 3s; S. Mill, 10s; H. Willcox, 2s; R.F.B., £3; T.W.R., £1; H.S.M., 2s 6d; D. H. Strathern and Friends, 5s; H. Tinkler, 5s; O. Greene, £2; F. Renouf, 5s; R. McLeod, 5s; 'Director', £2; D.M., 6s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; P. N. Brinson, 10s; J. Purton, 7s 6d.

Other contributions include:

J. Fernie, 5s; W. Davies, 3s; V.K.M., 4s; J. Basil, 1s; A. F. Whillock, 1s 6d; R. N. Milton, 8s; C. F. C. Padel, 8s; A. R. Watson, 8s; Wm. E. Robertson, 4s; J. J. Hicks, 2s 6d; Hampstead Town C.P. Branch, 12s 6d; R. Farrell, 8s; R. E. Selway, 8s; R. J. Willers, 8s; M. Knill, 3s; H. Lubbock, £4 8s; D. J. Holman, 8s; P.B. (Switzerland), 8s; L. A. Harlow, 3s 6d; F. Bamping, 3s 6d; D. Parsons, 3s; W. T. West, 4s; A. G. Pope, 2s; W. Ewart, 2s; B. H. Steel, 8s; B. D. Youatt, 18s; 'Sergeant', 5s; F. W. Sutton, 2s 6d; J. J. Ward Haugh, 4s; R. E. Billing, 2s.

Our thanks to you all.

ANGELA TUCKETT.

Co-op. number L99482.

134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

SCIENCE AND SOCIETY

ESTABLISHED 1936

Volume XIV, No. 2—Spring,
1950

TAGORE AND CLASS
FORCES IN INDIA

Ramkrishna Mukherjee



THE INEXHAUSTIBLE
ELECTRON

Mario Bunge



HUMAN HEREDITY and
ENVIRONMENT

Bernard J. Stern



THE TRANSITION
FROM FEUDALISM TO
CAPITALISM

Paul M. Sweezy

REPLY by *Maurice Dobb*



REVIEWS



Quarterly, 50 cents Single Copy
\$2.00 per year (\$2.50 foreign)

SCIENCE & SOCIETY

30 East 20th St., New York 3, NY

English Representative:

COLLET'S LTD.

40 Gt. Russell St., London W.C.1.

LABOUR RESEARCH

July issue includes:

"Profit Margins"

"Why Housing Costs are
High"

"Low Wages"

Monthly 6d.; p.a., 7s.

LABOUR RESEARCH
DEPARTMENT

2 Soho Square, London, W.1.

Studies in European Realism

By

Professor George Lukacs

288 pp. Demy 8vo., 21s.

A brilliant analysis by a famous Marxist literary critic of the writings of Balzac, Stendhal, Zola, Tolstoy, Gorki and others.

'The present "Studies" are the most important contribution to Marxist literary criticism to be published in this country since Caudwell's *Illusion and Reality*'. ('Daily Worker').

'He (Lukacs) is by far the most formidable exponent of the Marxist point of view in literary criticism that has yet appeared, and every serious student of literature should try to come to terms with such a positive theory and practice'. ('The Listener').

HILLWAY PUBLISHING CO.,

5 Hillway, London, N.6

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Dorchester and District Newspapers, Ltd. (T.U.), Dorchester, Great Britain.